UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/849,916	05/04/2001	Sreekanth Voleti	H00-01602 (256.103US1)	9104

21186   7590   04/21/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER
LOHN, JOSHUA A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2114	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 February 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-16 and 18-23</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>17</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>04 May 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

FINAL REJECTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to applicant's arguments that Henrikson fails to disclose an initial selection of a frame to be analyzed, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Henrikson discloses the selection of events to be analyzed (Henrikson, col. 4, line 65 through col. 5, line 2). The examiner reasonably interprets these events to be the frame as it is broadly claimed.

With respect to applicant's arguments that Henrikson fails to disclose using a text file to identify function code formats, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Henrikson discloses a user interface that provides the ability to select events from a list of prospective events (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25). The examiner interprets this list to be inherently in the form of a text file, this is because the list is provided electronically and the events to be selected from are described textually. The function code formats would be the various selections possible, provided this text-based list.

With respect to applicant's arguments that Henrikson fails to disclose calculating values for fields based on the function code formats the examiner respectfully disagrees. Henrikson discloses the creation of filters based upon the selected events, or function code formats selected from the text list (Henrikson, col. 56, lines 29-47). These filters are interpreted to be the fields of the currently claimed invention. They are calculated based upon the function code formats provided by the user selections mentioned above.

With respect to applicant's arguments that Henrikson fails to disclose a user viewable interpretation of received frames or packets in a frame, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Henrikson discloses user viewable output from the event analysis (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 35-67). The captured data provides indications of the events that were detected by the event filter, and these would obvious be an interpretation of the frames that were passing through the system. The interpretation would provide the information corresponding to the filters that were set through the use of function code formats described above.

With respect to applicant's arguments that Henrikson discloses a text file of very different organization that is not used to interpret the data in the frame or packets of the frame, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The text file of Henrikson, as described above, fits with a broad, yet reasonable, interpretation of the text file organization as detailed in the claim language. The text file of Henrikson is used in the interpretation of the data in the frame or packets of the frame because it is used in the selection of the events, which calculate the filters, which are used to interpret the data events being monitored, the steps of which are all detailed above in the previous arguments.

With respect to applicant's arguments that Henrikson discloses on a description of how to select frames based on filters, not how to interpret the frames once captured, the examiner respectfully disagrees. During the data capture all the events must be analyzed and interprets to see if they fit the criteria selected in the previous steps of initializing the filters.

The examiner feels that the interpretation of the claims used in the previous arguments was a broad, yet reasonable interpretation of the current claim language. In light of these arguments, the rejections of the previous office action are maintained and reiterated below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-16, and 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Henrikson, United States Patent number 5,923,673, published July 13, 1999.

As per claim 1, Henrikson discloses a computer implemented method of analyzing

frames on a process control bus, the method comprising: selecting a frame to be analyzed

(Henrikson, col. 4, lines 65 through col. 5, line 2, where the frame is the event selected to be

monitored); using a text file to identify function code formats (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25,

where providing the user choices would involve some text based user readable file that is then

used to indicate a function code for related events); and calculating values for fields based on the

function code formats (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 35-47, where the digital codes indicate events to

be captured by filters that then calculate field values).

As per claim 2, Henrikson further discloses providing the values of the fields to a display

(Henrikson, col. 5, lines 57-59).

As per claim 3, Henrikson further discloses reading data from a text file prior to selecting

a frame (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25).

As per claim 4, Henrikson further discloses storing data from the text file in a data

structure (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 19-20).

As per claim 5, Henrikson further discloses searching for a matching record for the frame in the data structure (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 35-47).

As per claim 6, Henrikson further discloses that calculating values for fields based on the function code formats comprises finding a value in the frame and matching it to a corresponding verbal description from the text file (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-47).

As per claims 7-9, these claims are software implementations of the methods claims 1-3. Henrikson discloses the use of software in column 4, lines 53-54, and all other aspects of these claims are taught as mentioned above in the rejection of claims 1-3, thus Henrikson discloses the invention of claims 7-9.

As per claim 10, Henrikson discloses a system for interpreting packets on a process control bus, the system comprising: a communication module for coupling to the process control bus (Henrikson, col. 4, lines 34-37); a receive queue that receives a frame from the communication module (Henrikson, col. 4, lines 37-42, where the data capture device acts as a queue in the process of storing data in the main memory, col. 5, lines 37-39); an interpretation file (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25, where trigger selections and associated digital data act as an interpretation file); and a receive module that compares records in the frame with records in the interpretation file to provide a user viewable interpretation of the frame (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 35-49).

As per claim 11, Henrikson further discloses a statistics module coupled to the receive queue for generating statistics regarding frames received from the process control bus (Henrikson, col. 7, lines 36-39).

As per claim 12, Henrikson further discloses that the statistics provide information selected from the group consisting of function codes, number of frames, master identification (Henrikson, col. 7, lines 32-49, where the types of requests act as function codes, the usage information indicates a number of frames, and the origin information indicates the master identification), errors (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 49-51), and slave identification (Henrikson, col. 4, lines 46-49, where it is inherent that the destination of each is provided for each packet and acts as a slave identifier).

As per claim 13, Henrikson further discloses a data link layer that identifies packets of data in frames (Henrikson, col. 4, line 65 through col. 5, line 2, where the ability to recognize each packet indicates that they are able to be accessed at the link layer as a frame that includes all relevant data, Henrikson, col. 5, lines 39-49).

As per claim 14, Henrikson further discloses an interpretation editor for modifying the interpretation files (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25, where the user selections act as an editor for modifying the interpretation files).

As per claim 15, Henrikson further discloses that the interpretation file comprises a text file having information about data packets moving on the control bus (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25).

As per claim 16, Henrikson further discloses that the text file comprises identifications of function codes and information regarding the interpretation of such function codes (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25, where the trigger events represent function codes that are translated into digital data representations).

As per claim 18, Henrikson further discloses means for converting an interpretation file into structured records a data structure for use by the receive module in interpreting frames (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 26-39).

As per claim 19, Henrikson further discloses a log file coupled to the interpretation file, wherein the log file contains data received from the control bus (Henrikson, col. 4, lines 34-52 and col. 5, lines 32-39, where the captured data represents a log file).

As per claim 20, Henrikson further discloses an offline viewer coupled to the log files and interpretation file that interprets data packets in frames (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 57-59).

As per claim 21, Henrikson discloses a system for interpreting packets on a process control bus, the system comprising: a receive queue that receives packets of data in frames on the process control bus (Henrikson, col. 4, lines 34-52); an interpretation file (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25, where the triggers and equivalent digital data provide for the functional equivalent of an interpretation file); and a receive module that compares records in the frame with records in the interpretation file to provide a user viewable interpretation of the frame, wherein the receive module generates a user viewable screen of information describing the frames, and comprising a pane for each selected frame that identifies interpretations of fields in the frame (Henrikson, col. 8, lines 7-28, and col. 5, line 57 through col. 6, line 14, where each event is displayed independently).

As per claim 22, Henrikson further discloses a screen for configuring and setting options for monitoring frames on the process control bus (Henrikson, col. 5, lines 11-25).

As per claim 23, Henrikson further discloses a statistics screen (Henrikson, col. 7, lines 32-49).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 17 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua A. Lohn whose telephone number is (571) 272-3661. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JAL

SCOTT BADERMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER